

2/27/02

X8

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/964,542	CRANE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeremy C. Norris	2827

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeremy C. Norris. (3) Mr. Bill Batista (37,525).
 (2) Dave Talbott. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 February 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 47.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 5,034,800 (Marchisi).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



DAVID L. TALBOTT
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Batista argued that the Marchisi reference failed to anticipate the instantly claimed invention primarily because it failed to display the limitation that the leads be inserted through the sidewalls. Furthermore, Mr. Basista argued that the structure that Examiner Norris had stated anticipated the limitation of the sidewalls were actually not walls in the sense understood by a skilled artisan because the top and bottom halves disclosed in the invention of Marchisi were never joined to form the two walls required in the instantly claimed invention. Instead, the two halves formed four separate walls with the leads placed between them. Examiner Norris found this argument to be compelling over the reference in question, but stated that further consideration of prior art may be needed. Additionally, Mr. Batista agreed to make these arguments clear on the record in response to the previous Final Action given by the Office.